

Procedure Year: 2025

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-17842

Procedure Department: CO - Nigeria - Abuja

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Oluwatosin Ologunla

Created by: Oluwatosin Ologunla,9/9/2025, 6:10 AM

Last Modified by: Daisy Foday,9/9/2025, 7:06 AM

Portfolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01000401	Enhancing National Capacities for Counter-Violent Extremism, Anti-Piracy and Protection of Civilians Project	CO - Nigeria - Abuja	Financially Closed		3/1/2023	12/31/2025

Approval Information

Approval Date: Tue Sep 09 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Daisy Foday <daisy.foday@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-09-09 07:06:19	Approved	Daisy Foday
Approval Request Submitted	2025-09-09 06:56:45	Started	Oluwatosin Ologunla

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Exemplary

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project proactively identified changes in the external environment and incorporated them into its strategy. The project team continuously monitored evolving security dynamics, particularly the instability in Kaduna, and adapted implementation plans by relocating activities to Abuja to ensure participant safety and effective delivery. Additionally, the reassignment of key personnel

at MLAILPKC was promptly addressed through early engagement with the new leadership to maintain project continuity.

The project’s risk management framework included quarterly updates and mitigation strategies for emerging threats such as insecurity, health emergencies, and stakeholder engagement challenges. These risks were not only identified but also integrated into the project’s monitoring and evaluation plan, with documented actions taken to address them.

There is clear evidence that the project board considered these implications and adjusted the strategy accordingly, demonstrating responsiveness and strategic alignment with the changing context.

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☒ 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project was well aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan. It directly responded to the development setting of crisis and fragility, addressing violent extremism, piracy, and protection of civilians—key issues in conflict-affected regions. The project adopted the Signature Solution on “Strengthening effective, inclusive and accountable governance,” as evidenced by its contribution to UNSDCF/CPD Outcome 4, which promotes inclusive, transparent, and gender-sensitive governance systems.

Furthermore, the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) included relevant Strategic Plan output indicators, such as the number of participants trained in counter-violent extremism, protection of civilians, and anti-piracy measures. These indicators align with CPD Output 3.4, which focuses on strengthening systems and capacities for peacebuilding and development transitions.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory
----------	------------------	-------------------------------------

3. Are the project’s targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project systematically engaged targeted groups, including marginalized and vulnerable populations, with a clear focus on leaving no one behind (LNOB). The training courses on counter-violent extremism, protection of civilians, and anti-piracy included participants from diverse backgrounds—military, paramilitary, and civilians—across ECOWAS and Gulf of Guinea countries. Gender inclusion was prioritized, with women representing up to 32% of participants in some courses, aligning with the project’s GEN2 rating and its 30% gender participation target.

Beneficiary feedback was actively collected through post-training evaluations and human interest stories, which highlighted the relevance and impact of the courses on participants’ professional roles. While there is no explicit mention of representatives from

marginalized groups being part of the project board, the feedback gathered was used to inform project decisions, such as relocating activities from Kaduna to Abuja due to security concerns.

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☒ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project generated knowledge and lessons learned that informed management decisions to ensure continued relevance and quality. Key lessons were documented in the final report, including the strategic relocation of activities from Kaduna to Abuja due to security concerns, which enhanced participant safety and engagement. The project also emphasized the importance of early and persistent engagement with MLAILPKC leadership and staff, joint planning, and capacity building on UNDP procedures to improve delivery.

These insights, though primarily drawn from internal implementation experience, were used to adapt project strategies and mitigate risks. While there is no explicit mention of formal learning mechanisms such as After Action Reviews or documented project board minutes, the adjustments made reflect a responsive management approach.

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☒ 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- ☐ 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project reached a meaningful scale during its implementation, directly benefiting 97 participants (including 34 women) from six ECOWAS and Gulf of Guinea countries through specialized training in counter-violent extremism, protection of civilians, and anti-piracy. These participants were drawn from military, paramilitary, and civilian institutions, ensuring broad sectoral coverage and regional representation.

Moreover, the project builds on previous training cycles that reached 287 individuals, indicating a cumulative and expanding impact. The courses were designed to strengthen institutional capacities and inform policy and operational frameworks, particularly through MLAILPKC's role in peace support operations and national security strategies.

There is credible evidence that the project contributed to development change by enhancing regional security capacities and promoting inclusive governance.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☒ 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project included relevant measures to address gender inequalities and empower women, and these measures produced the intended effect. The project was rated GEN2, indicating that advancing gender equality was a significant objective. It set a target of 30% female participation across all activities and achieved this in key trainings—e.g., 32% of participants in the Protection of Civilians course were women.

Gender-disaggregated data was systematically collected and analyzed through training reports and monitoring tools. This informed adjustments such as ensuring gender-sensitive course content, inclusive selection criteria, and the integration of gender-sensitive indicators in project assessments. The project also ensured that Terms of Reference for consultants and implementing partners included gender sensitivity requirements.

While there is no explicit mention of formal gender-focused evaluations or workshops, the consistent use of gender data to inform planning and implementation demonstrates a structured approach.

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments were conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for high/substantial-risk projects and targeted assessments for moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented, and monitored for identified risks. Select this option for SESP exempted projects and/or categorized as low risk through the SESP.
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project successfully managed and monitored social and environmental risks. Risks were tracked through a dedicated risk log, with insecurity in Kaduna identified early and mitigated by relocating activities to Abuja. This ensured participant safety and continuity of implementation.

Environmental considerations were integrated into project design and implementation. The project complied with UN policies on plastic use and promoted environmental consciousness during planning and execution. ICT infrastructure improvements, including green energy supply for training facilities, further demonstrate environmental sensitivity.

While the report does not explicitly mention an updated Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) or formal Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA), the project appears to be low-risk and exempt from such requirements. Relevant mitigation measures were implemented and monitored effectively.

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

While the project was likely low-risk and may have been exempt from a formal Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), there is no evidence or documentation of grievance procedures or how potential complaints were addressed. There is also no indication that any grievances were raised, received or resolved during implementation. As such, based on the available evidence

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☐ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan was adequately implemented. The plan was costed and integrated into project activities, with regular monitoring visits and continuous engagement with MLAILPKC to ensure compliance and effective delivery. Progress against indicators in the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) was tracked, including sex-disaggregated data for training participants.

The project reported achievements against its Annual Work Plan targets, such as the number of beneficiaries trained in counter-violent extremism, protection of civilians, and anti-piracy. Lessons learned—such as the importance of relocating activities for security and early engagement with partners—were documented and used to inform adjustments.

While there is no mention of formal evaluations or After-Action Reviews meeting UNEG standards, the consistent use of monitoring data and feedback to guide implementation reflects a structured and responsive M&E approach.

10. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)

- ☒ 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

UNDP maintained continuous engagement with MLAILPKC and other stakeholders, and that project decisions—such as relocating activities due to insecurity and managing leadership transitions—were informed by monitoring, lessons learned, and risk assessments.

While this suggests that some governance functions were carried out, there is no clear documentation of structured board meetings or formal decision-making processes.

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project adequately monitored and managed risks. A risk log was maintained and updated, identifying key risks such as insecurity in Kaduna and personnel changes at MLAILPKC. These risks were actively monitored, and mitigation measures were implemented—such as relocating activities to Abuja for safety and initiating early engagement with new leadership to ensure continuity.

The project’s monitoring and evaluation section confirms that risks were reviewed regularly, and mitigation strategies were integrated into planning and implementation. While the report does not explicitly state that risk assessments were conducted quarterly or that assumptions were formally validated with security advisors, the documented actions reflect a proactive approach to risk management.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory
-----------	------------------	-------------------------------------

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, adequate resources were mobilized to achieve the intended results of the project. The total budget was US\$300,000, with a programmable fund of US\$297,030. By the end of the reporting period, the project had expended US\$280,887.85, representing 93.6% of the total budget. This high utilization rate indicates that financial resources were effectively allocated and used to deliver planned activities.

All key outputs—training on counter-violent extremism, protection of civilians, and anti-piracy—were completed successfully, with participant targets met or exceeded. There is no indication that expected results had to be adjusted due to funding constraints. Instead, the project demonstrated efficient financial management and delivery within the approved budget.

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, project inputs were procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results. Although the report does not explicitly mention a formal procurement plan, the successful and timely implementation of all planned activities—including three major training courses across multiple countries—indicates that procurement processes were well managed.

The project achieved full delivery of its outputs within the reporting period, with no documented delays or disruptions due to procurement issues. Facilities, training materials, logistics, and expert facilitators were mobilized effectively, including access to naval and marine infrastructure for the anti-piracy course in Lagos.

Given the smooth execution and absence of procurement-related bottlenecks, it is reasonable to conclude that procurement was adequately planned and managed.

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- ☒ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project monitored cost efficiencies and demonstrated prudent financial management. The final report shows that 93.6% of the total budget was utilized, with detailed expenditure tracking across activities. For example, the anti-piracy course exceeded its budget due to strategic decisions to host it in Lagos, allowing access to naval facilities and enhancing training quality through experiential learning.

While there is no evidence of systematic benchmarking against other projects or industry standards, the project did coordinate with partners such as MLAILPKC, ECOWAS institutions, and the Government of Japan to optimize resource use. Joint planning and early engagement with stakeholders helped avoid delays and ensured efficient delivery.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
-----------	------------------	------------------------------

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes.

Evidence:

The project successfully delivered all expected outputs within the reporting period. It trained 30 participants in counter-violent

extremism, 37 in protection of civilians, and 30 in anti-piracy and maritime crime prevention—exceeding or meeting targets set in the Annual Work Plan. Activities were completed on schedule, and the cumulative expenditure reached 93.6% of the total budget, indicating efficient resource utilization. The project also adapted to contextual challenges, such as relocating activities from Kaduna to Abuja due to security concerns, ensuring continuity and safety.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- ☐ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project conducted regular reviews of the work plan to ensure activities remained on track and aligned with desired results. Monitoring and Evaluation activities included continuous engagement with MLAILPKC, tracking progress against Annual Work Plan targets, and adjusting implementation strategies based on lessons learned—such as relocating activities from Kaduna to Abuja due to security concerns.

While the report does not explicitly mention quarterly reviews or formal After-Action Reviews, it documents responsive management decisions and budget adjustments that reflect ongoing assessment and course correction. All planned outputs were delivered within budget and timeline, indicating that work plan reviews were effectively used to guide implementation.

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☐ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project systematically identified and engaged targeted groups, including those marginalized and vulnerable, to ensure results were achieved as expected. Beneficiaries were drawn from military, paramilitary, and civilian institutions across ECOWAS and Gulf of Guinea countries, with deliberate inclusion of women—achieving up to 32% female participation in some courses.

The project targeted regions affected by violent extremism and piracy, using contextual data on insecurity and institutional capacity gaps to inform participant selection. Engagement with beneficiaries occurred through training sessions, feedback mechanisms, and human interest stories, which confirmed that participants benefited from the interventions and committed to applying the knowledge gained.

While there is no explicit mention of refined targeting based on ongoing assessments, the consistent inclusion of diverse and vulnerable groups and the use of feedback to inform implementation demonstrate a structured approach.

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- ☐ 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP's digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- ☒ 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- ☐ 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- ☐ The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

While the report highlights the use of ICT infrastructure and digital tools to enhance training delivery—such as projectors, interactive platforms, and green energy systems—these were limited to supporting in-person capacity-building activities.

There is no mention of custom-built digital platforms, data systems, or software solutions developed or deployed under the project. As such, no specific technology or data risks related to hosting, licensing, data ownership, or sustainability were identified or addressed.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

19. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, stakeholders and national partners were actively engaged in the decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of the project. The project was jointly designed and executed by UNDP Nigeria, the Government of Japan, and the Martin Luther Agwai International Leadership and Peacekeeping Centre (MLAILPKC), with strong collaboration from ECOWAS and Gulf of Guinea Member States.

National institutions such as the Ministry of Budget and National Planning, Nigerian Army, Navy, Air Force, Police, and NIMASA played key roles in participant selection, course facilitation, and logistical support. Continuous engagement with MLAILPKC ensured effective implementation and monitoring, including compliance checks and feedback integration.

While the report does not confirm exclusive use of national systems for procurement and evaluation, it demonstrates that national partners were central to project delivery and oversight.

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were

- formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project monitored changes in the capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and adjusted implementation arrangements accordingly. Continuous engagement with MLAILPKC was maintained throughout the project, including regular compliance checks and capacity-building support on UNDP financial and project management procedures.

The report highlights that changes in leadership at MLAILPKC were addressed through early engagement with the new Commandant to ensure continuity. Additionally, the relocation of activities from Kaduna to Abuja due to security concerns reflects adaptive implementation based on institutional and contextual capacity assessments.

While the report does not detail the use of formal indicators or HACT assurance activities, it provides credible evidence of responsive management and adjustments aligned with partner capacities.

21. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

While the project successfully delivered its outputs and engaged national institutions like MLAILPKC, there is no mention of structured transition arrangements or documented adjustments based on financial commitments or institutional capacity changes.

Although the project demonstrated adaptive management—such as relocating activities due to security concerns and engaging new leadership at MLAILPKC—these actions were operational rather than part of a reviewed sustainability strategy.